



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Viginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/003,258	12/06/2001	Nobuyuki Ohminami	829-593	4463
759	90 07/22/2003			
NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C. 8th Floor 1100 North Glebe Road			EXAMINER	
			HAMDAN, WASSEEM H	
Arlington, VA 22201-4714			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2854	
			DATE MAILED: 07/22/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b></b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	10/003,258	OHMINAMI, NOBUYUKI				
·	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Wasseem H Hamdan	2854				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 02 July 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a				
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]	·				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offic timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CF f extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP  R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension  unt of the fee. The appropriate extension  originally set in the final Office action; or				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:					
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);				
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);					
<ul> <li>(c)  they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or</li> </ul>	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the				
(d)  they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of fi	inally rejected claims.				
NOTE:						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):	•				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment				
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NOT place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to: 4,10.						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-3 and 5-9</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. ☑ The proposed drawing correction filed on <u>02 July 2003</u> is a) ☑ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.						
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)					
10. Other: _						
		drew H. Hirshfeld Isory patent examiner				

**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800** 

Ţ



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The arguments merely rehash arguments already of record. All applicants' arguments have been traversed and addressed in the final Office Action mailed on 04/08/03. The response is insufficient to overcome the prior art. The Examiner's position is that the rejection as set forth in the final rejection mailed on 04/08/03 (paper No.6) still renders the claimed invention unpatent.